



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SERMO DE CONFUSIONE DIABOLI.

WHEN J. C. W. Augusti, early in the last century, was making search in the Royal Library at Vienna for unedited works of Eusebius of Emesa,¹ he was not aware that two manuscripts among its stores offered interesting additions to the material already collected by him. The one of these might have furnished him, in the Greek, a sequel to the *Oratorio in sacrum Parasceues diem* which he had published;² the other contained an early Latin version of both these homilies, made from a text in which they had been combined into a single narrative. To the first of these manuscripts Thilo³ promptly called attention, and re-edited the text, which had already appeared among the spurious writings of St. Chrysostom in the editions of Savile and Montfaucon; the Latin translation, here published for the first time,⁴ is the following *Sermo de Confusione Diaboli*.

The Vienna manuscript in which this sermon is found is *Cod. Lat.*, 1370 [Rec. 3324]; it is of parchment, with page size 17.8 × 12.3 cm. The tenth century is the date assigned for the manuscript in the *Tabulae Codicum* edited by the Vienna Academy, 1864 ff., and likewise in the earlier catalogue of Denis.⁵ But Karl Schenkl, who copied a portion of the manuscript for Georg Schepss,⁶ correctly ascribed it to the century preceding. I can find nothing further regarding the previous history of the manuscript, except that it seems not to have been in the library when Tengnagel prepared an autograph catalogue

¹ *Eusebii Emeseni quae supersunt Opuscula Graeca*, Elberfeld, 1829.

² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

³ J. C. THILO, *Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emesa*, Halle, 1832.

⁴ On this point I have received assurance from Dom Germain Morin, of Abbey Maredsou to whom I would here express my appreciation of his courtesy. My thanks are due likewise to Professor E. von Dobschütz, now of Strassburg, for answering various inquiries.

⁵ Vol. II, col. 2041, No. DCCCXXXI. Denis in his careful fashion, makes characteristic excerpts from the sermon, which he describes (col. 2053) as *narratio conficta ad imitationem spurii Evangelii Nicodemi*. He did not observe, apparently, that the text is a translation of the two homilies of Eusebius. I am indebted to Mr. C. H. Beeson, at present in Munich, for copying the note from Denis, whose work I could not procure here, and for making investigation with regard to Tengnagel's catalogue.

⁶ *Sermo Boetii*, foll. 83-88 v. See *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Vol. XXXVIII (1895), p. 270.

of its possessions.¹ The ultimate provenance of the manuscript is undoubtedly France. Professor Ludwig Traube, of Munich, who kindly examined specimens of the writing, was inclined to regard it as a product of the school of Orléans. The volume contains various works of an ecclesiastical character, such as excerpts from Isidore, Prosper, and Gregory the Great, several catechisms and creeds, the *Sermo Boetii* edited by Schepss, and last of all, foll. 107-20^v., the present sermon.

The subject of the sermon, which, as the title partially indicates, is the Harrowing of Hell, at once suggests some sort of kinship between the present narrative and the so-called *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Whether this relation is one of precedence or of imitation is a question which formed the core of the controversy between Thilo and Augusti, and which most scholars today, I imagine, would decide in favor of the former. The authorship of the homilies, to be sure, has not yet been definitely settled; although the name of the writer is clearly Eusebius, and the title Alexandrinus is given him in some manuscripts, it is difficult to identify him further; whether he is Eusebius of Emesa, as Augusti believed, or a writer of Alexandria as Thilo and, independently, Cardinal Angelo Mai² declared, may still be matter for argument. However, the sermons seem rather an elaborated form of the story as told in the *Gospel of Nicodemus* than a source of the same,³ and since this work is now assigned by the best authority⁴ to the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, it is probable that our Eusebius is not the Bishop of Emesa, who died about 360.

¹ *Catalogus manuscriptorum . . . Bibliothecae Augustissimae Caesareae Vindobonensis. Descriptus ex autographo Sebastiani Tegnagelii I. V. D. qui ad 1608 praefectus Bibliothecae obiit a^o 1636*. This rare volume, in manuscript, was presented to Harvard College Library by Professor C. R. Gregory, of Leipzig. It formed the basis of the classification introduced by Lambecius in 1663. See his *Comment. de Aug. Bibl. Caes. Vind.*, ed. alt. (1776), Vol. I, pp. 121, 152. The system of numbering, however, employed by Lambecius in the above-named work does not tally with that in this catalogue. The latter, apparently, has never been printed.

² *Spicileg. Rom.* (1843), Vol. X, pp. i ff.; *Nov. Patr. Bibl.* (1844), Vol. II, pp. 499 f.

³ As Denis observed. See above, p. 1, n. 5.

⁴ VON DOBSCHÜTZ, in HASTINGS'S *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. III, p. 545, § iv; A. MAURY, *Croyances et Légendes de l'Antiquité*, 1863, pp. 326 ff. Maury believes, however, with Augusti, that the author of the sermon is Eusebius of Emesa (pp. 219, 313). The ABBÉ MIGNE (*Patrol. Graec.*, Vol. LXXXVI, c. 535), after printing Sermon B (Augusti) with those of Eusebius of Alexandria, retracts, on noting the close connection between its beginning and the end of Sermon A, II (Augusti). But Thilo had included *all* the sermons printed by Augusti with the works of Eusebius Alexandrinus.

Probably, then, these homilies were written in the fifth or the sixth century, and as a Eusebius of Alexandria flourished in each of these epochs, we may, with the manuscripts, call our author Alexandrinus, leaving it for further investigation to settle his date. Mai is inclined to put him in the fifth century, Thilo,¹ after some hesitation, in the sixth, and the latter is the date accepted by von Dobschütz.² In either the fifth or the sixth century, then, Eusebius of Alexandria wrote two sermons, one for Maunday Thursday, the other for Good Friday,³ thus telling in two chapters the story of the Harrowing of Hell. It is not surprising that these parts were combined later—or possibly by the writer himself—into a single narrative,⁴ or that this was soon given the honor of a translation into Latin. For the story is well told; barring certain repetitions of the New Testament narrative, which would have profited by condensation, it has the life and movement of a little drama.

It may be reasonably inferred, I have implied, that the Latin translation was made in the fifth or sixth century, and not in the ninth, the date of our unique manuscript of the text. Taking into account the state of learning in the ninth century, as well as the general conditions of manuscript transmission, this is *a priori* the most natural hypothesis, and should be accepted as valid, unless some positive refutation can be presented. The character of the Latin would not disgrace a translator of sermons in the fifth or the sixth century. Mistakes and curious idioms there are, but some of these may be paralleled in writers of the same age or earlier;⁵ some are due to the translator's desire to reproduce his

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 55, 57, 80 (f) ² *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 545 (g). ³ THILO, *op. cit.*, p. 84, n. 1.

⁴ The two sermons have in several cases been transmitted together, although not forming a single narrative: see THILO, p. 31. *Cod. Coislin.*, p. 121, n. 60 (MONTFAUCON, *Bibl. Coislin.*, p. 197) begins at the same words (ἀκούσας ὁ διάβολος) as the Latin does, but the second sermon immediately follows in separate form. A case parallel to that of our Latin sermon is offered by the *Acta Andreae* (ed. M. BONNET, *Supplem. Cod. Apocr.*, Vol. II, 1895), which grew from three sermons into a single narrative. See VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S review, *Litterarisches Centralblatt* (1896), c. 649.

⁵ To specify a few noticeable peculiarities, the nominative absolute (see below, pp. 14, n. 21; 15, ll. 9, 10) is found in Ennodius (see A. DUBOIS, *La latinité d'Ennodius*, Paris, 1903, p. 380); *cum* with the accusative (see pp. 10, l. 9; 11, l. 16; 4, ll. 24, 26) is a well-known feature of popular Latin, occurring, for instance, in letters written to St. Cyprian (see L. BAYARD, *Le Latin de Saint Cyprien*, Paris, 1902, p. 158); *uenisti ad rapere* (p. 17, l. 26) can be matched with St. Augustine's *cum ueneris ad bibere*, *Serm.* 225, cap. 4: see A. REGNIER, *De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin*, Paris, 1886, p. 106.

original closely;¹ others, to the unintelligent effort of the ninth-century scribe to fill in the suspensions of the original text²—to say nothing of the usual careless blunders. Certain of these scribal errors show that the manuscript is a copy, not an autograph,³ though there is no clear evidence from the nature of the mistakes that the archetype was written in uncials or capitals.⁴ No conclusions may be drawn from the character of the Biblical citations, since a translator of the fifth or the sixth century might well have used either the “Itala” or the version of St. Jerome; as a matter of fact, in the majority of passages Itala and Vulgate happen to agree; in a few, our text presents the former, and in a few, the latter rendering, while other citations are made inaccurately from memory. In one or two instances it is plain that the translator simply renders his Greek text without reference to the current Latin versions. No other indications are apparent from which the date of the work may be inferred, and as no conclusive proof to the contrary is forthcoming, it is most natural to assume that the translation was made in the fifth century, and not in the ninth.

With proper deference to the opinion of Montfaucon, who regretted that Savile, in editing the second of our two sermons, had dragged into the light of day that which was *perpetuis dignum tenebris*,⁴ I venture to think that the text here published may be of interest in several respects. In the first place, it may possibly shed some light on the authorship of the Latin homilies ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa. These homilies, in various collections, are now generally regarded as supposititious; some are ascribed to St. Bruno Astensis, Bishop of Segni, who died 1125; others to writers like Faustus of Rhegium or Caesarius of Arles,

¹ See below, pp. 11, n. 9; 12, n. 15; 15, n. 16.

² The suspensions are comparatively frequent, and, in some cases, of an unusual character. *E. g.*, *discip̄* = *discipulis* (p. 14, n. 18); *moṛ* = *mortuos* (p. 15, n. 15); for *dicens*, *diē* (p. 16, n. 5) and for *respondens*, *respā* (p. 16, n. 13) and *rpā* (pp. 13, n. 7; 18, n. 7) occur. Errors in filling out similar abbreviations are doubtless illustrated by pp. 14, n. 11; 15, n. 11; 16, n. 4. I have an impression, the validity of which I cannot prove, that the present text was copied from an uncial or capital manuscript in which suspensions were numerous.

³ See pp. 11, nn. 1, 8; 16, n. 15.

⁴ *Op. Chrysostomi*, Paris, ed. 1838, Vol. XI, p. 864.

who flourished in the fifth or the sixth century.¹ But Thilo presented a vigorous argument to show that the fourteen sermons edited by Sirmond as works of Eusebius of Cæsarea translate genuine sermons of Eusebius of Emesa;² Cardinal Mai, finding a Vatican manuscript of the eleventh century, which contained thirty-four of the homilies and bore the title *liber Domini Eusebii qui translatus* [Cod., *quem translatus*] *est ex Hebraeo in Latinum*, concluded that Eusebius might well have written Hebrew sermons, which various hands turned into Latin;³ and finally, as Dom Morin certifies, there is evidence that sermons of Eusebius (whether of Emesa or of Alexandria) were circulated in the occident as early as the sixth century. The present text we now know is a translation of two sermons of Eusebius (Alexandrinus). May it perhaps serve as a touchstone for detecting other genuine bits in the mass of material associated with his name?

In a second respect the sermon may have value, namely for the reconstruction of the Greek text of which it is a translation. While it will hardly play the rôle which distinguishes the Latin versions of the *Gospel of Nicodemus* in the textual criticism of that work,⁴ its readings will be worth consulting. It were rash to attempt many decisions on the basis of the present editions of the text—Mai's I suspect, is somewhat doctored—but a few cases are already apparent where the testimony of the Latin version is of moment.⁵ Its worth can be gauged exactly when the Homilies of Eusebius appear in the critical edition which Professor von Dobschütz has in preparation.

Finally our sermon gives us a new instance of the influence of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*—indirect, in this case—on mediæval literature, and suggests a consideration which Wülcker, in his treatment of this theme, did not take into account. In his work

¹ For a résumé of the discussion of this question see J. FESSLER, *Institutiones Patrologiae*, Vol. II, p. 2 (in MIGNE, *Patr. Graec.*, Vol. LXXXVI, c. 462 f.). Migne reprints some of the *Homiliae in Evangelia totius anni* with the works of BRUNO ASTENSIS, *Patr. Lat.*, Vol. CLXV, c. 735 ff.

² THILO, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 ff.

³ *Nov. Patr. Bibl.*, Vol. II, p. 528.

⁴ For the *Descensus*, they take precedence of the extant Greek MSS. See VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, 545 (g).

⁵ See, for instance, pp. 13, n. 1, n. 4; 17, n. 3.

entitled *Das Evangelium Nicodemi in der abendländischen Literatur* (Paderborn 1872), Wülcker draws a sharp contrast between the prominent part played by this gospel in early English vernacular literature and its much later appearance in the popular literature of other European countries. Nobody could quarrel with this statement if left in precisely this form, but Wülcker implies further that outside England the work was not popularly known before the twelfth century.¹ This assumption underlies his extensive refutation² of the statement of Fabricius that the title *Evangelium Nicodemi* was given to the work in England on account of the predilection of the English for their especial apostle Nicodemus. Wülcker takes pains to show that Nicodemus held no such position in the imagination of Anglo-Saxon writers, that this distinction belongs rather to Joseph of Arimathea, and that even the latter legend did not take form until the twelfth century. For the explanation of Fabricius, Wülcker substitutes one of his own, namely, that on account of the very early introduction of Christianity into England, the *Gospel of Nicodemus* in particular, like Christian writings in general, enjoyed an early vogue and at once exerted an influence on popular literature. We may charitably pass the suggestion without remark,³ and see the simple solution of the matter in Wülcker's second explanation that as Anglo-Saxon literature was the first of the vernaculars to come to fruition, the story of the Harrowing of Hell was first told in that literature. But the assumption that the *Gospel of Nicodemus* was not popularly known as early in the other countries of Europe is groundless. To take the case of France, there are among the manuscripts of this work collated by von Dobschütz for his projected edition of the *Evangelium Nicodemi*, various ninth- and tenth-century codices which were written in France, and to these instruments of dissemination should now be added our

¹ See, e. g., WÜLCKER, *op. cit.*, for France, pp. 23 ff.; for Germany, pp. 34 ff.

² *Excurs*, Vol. I, p. 72. WÜLCKER states his problem at the outset with the words: "Woher kommt es nun, dass gerade in England sich unser Evangelium so früh verbreitet hat?"

³ Granting, as may well be the case (see LAPPENBERG, *Geschichte von England*, 1834, Vol. I, p. 45, to whom WÜLCKER, p. 75, refers; W. BRIGHT, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, 1896, pp. 358 ff.), that England received Christianity in the second or even the first century, we have to reckon here with the conditions of literary transmission in the fifth century—the date of the composition and translation of our Gospel.

Sermon, copied in France by a scribe of the ninth century. Clear evidence of the influence of the story on contemporary literature appears also in the poem of Audradus, *De Fonte Vitae*, which contains a description of the Harrowing of Hell,¹ preceded by a dialogue between Mors and Diabolus in the manner of the gospel and the sermon. These details are enough to hint at a general diffusion of the story in France long before the twelfth century; when the development of popular literature in that country ensued, the story was told in the vernacular as well.

Wülcker traces also the influence of the *Evangelium Nicodemi* on the liturgical drama of the Middle Ages, noting that the Harrowing of Hell formed part of the plot of a French mystery as early as the twelfth century.² Other authorities do not mention any trace of its appearance before the thirteenth,³ but taking into account the popularity of the story in the drama of the Middle Ages, and what our sermon has told us of its prevalence in ninth-century literature, we should not be surprised if further investigation revealed its appearance on the mediæval stage earlier than has hitherto been noted. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Chambers notes,⁴ such subjects as *Elisaeus*, *Convivium Herodis* already figured. The present homily with its vivid dialogues is in essence dramatic; it holds in solution the elements of a little drama which only a touch, it would seem, would precipitate into the actual dramatic form. Such material, accessible in the ninth century, might well have been utilized for the ecclesiastical stage before the thirteenth.

This possibility leads to another suggestion, namely that sermons in general may have exerted on the development of the mediæval drama an influence to which insufficient consideration has hitherto been paid. Augusti, in the work already cited, was not blind to the significance of the homilies of Eusebius in this respect. He in fact conceived them as deliberately modeled on

¹ *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Poet. Aev. Carol.*, ed. TRAUBE, Vol. III, pp. 73 ff. The passage on the Harrowing of Hell, begins at vs. 305.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

³ CREIZENACH, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, Vol. I (1893), pp. 55 f.; W. MEYER, *Fragmenta Burana, Götting'sche Abhandlungen, Festschrift* (1901), pp. 61, 68, 100; E. K. CHAMBERS, *The Mediæval Stage*, 1903, pp. 73 f.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

the lines of the Greek drama; their author, in the ancient fashion, had selected a theme, an *ὑπόθεσις*, not from his own imaginings, but from the traditional legends—in his case, the *mythologia Christiana*—and had then arranged his incidents in dramatic form, developing three distinct plots which were subtly connected by an inner unity of design. In short, the three homilies published by Augusti formed a *τριλογία δραματική*¹ on the theme *Diabolus deceptus et succussus*;² the play was a tragedy in structure—in essence, a *divina comoedia*.³ Reflecting that the concluding portion of the third of the sermons, which in fact was soon proved by Thilo to be part of a fourth sermon, might be reckoned as an independent piece, Augusti finally declared the whole a tetralogy, not a trilogy.⁴ Thilo, who devoted much energy to clipping the wings of Augusti's fancy, suggested *teratology* as a more appropriate title;⁵ he added that the concluding section of the fourth sermon, of which Augusti had not known, might serve as a satyric after-piece. A bit of this flagellation Augusti surely deserved, but none the less commendable is his insight into the essential spirit of these pieces: they are dramatic. When we consider that other sermons of a like character are not lacking—instances are given by both Augusti⁶ and Thilo⁷—the conviction grows that the course of the drama in the Middle Ages may have been shaped not only by the church liturgy, but by the sermon as well. The mediæval preacher could act on occasion; the ancient *pulpitum* has more than an etymological connection with the modern pulpit.

But leaving these questions to be worked out by others better fitted for the task, I offer here simply the text of the *Sermo de Confusione Diaboli*. A few obvious mistakes have been corrected

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 117.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 110.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 8, 27, 28. The last reference is to one of the sermons of Eusebius of Emesa, ascribed by Thilo to Caesarius of Arles. The passage quoted before this by Thilo from *Max. Bibl. Patr.*, Vol. VI, p. 754, is from one of the *Homiliae in Evangelia totius anni* (MIGNE, *Patr. Lat.*, Vol. CLXV, c. 807, No. LVIII, but not printed there): the sermon repeats in a lively manner the narrative of the *Evang. Nic.* If the present ascription to Bruno of Segni is correct, it gives us a specimen of a sermon on our story from the eleventh or the twelfth century. Bits of the "Eusebius" homilies on the same theme appear in two sermons falsely assigned to St. Augustine; see MIGNE, Vol. XXXIX, c. 2059, Nos. CLX and CLXI. PROFESSOR HULME's recent publication of two OE. homilies on the Harrowing of Hell (*MODERN PHILOLOGY*, Vol. I, p. 579), is of great interest in the present matter.

and a few conjectures proposed, but in general I have let the reading stand, if at all intelligible. I have often had recourse to the assistance of the available Greek texts, and in some cases have pointed to differences in the readings, or to omissions. This procedure has not been carried out systematically, however, as a thoroughgoing comparison will not be in place until the definitive edition of the Greek text is published by Professor von Dobschütz.

The following symbols of reference have been employed:

Serm. XV = the third of the sermons published by Augusti, p. 15. It is No. XV in the editions of Mai, *Spic. Rom.*, Vol. IX, p. 696, and Migne, *Patr. Graec.*, Vol. LXXXVI, c. 383. To it correspond pp. 10-14, l. 32 of the Latin text here printed.

Serm. XVII = the sequel to this sermon, No. XVII in Migne, *Patr. Graec.*, Vol. LXXXVI, c. 421; printed Vol. LXII, c. 721. To it correspond p. 14, ll. 32 to p. 18 of the Latin text. First edited, with the spurious works of St. Chrysostom, by Savile, Vol. VII (1612), p. 459; then by Montfaucon, Vol. XI (1718), p. 793; then by Thilo, p. 81. It appears in the Paris re-edition of Montfaucon by Gaume Frères, Vol. XI (1835-1839), p. 867. The general get-up of this and other publications of the same firm (*e. g.*, St. Augustine) was adopted (and cheapened) for the volumes in Migne's *Patrologia*. The Paris edition incorporates many of Thilo's notes, and agrees with him in his controversy with Augusti. Migne selects a few of these notes on the text, but omits the introductory section on Thilo, printing only Montfaucon's *Monitum*.

M = the text of Sermon XV, printed by Mai. This he tells us (*Spic. Rom.*, Vol. IX, p. 696, n. 1) is a composite of the readings of three Vatican manuscripts. Called in Migne *editio prima*.

V = The text of Sermon XV, and a section of Sermon XVII, published by Augusti, p. 15, as *editio prima*, from a Vienna manuscript—*Cod. Graec.* 284, Nessel. Called in Migne *editio altera*. To this text the Latin version most closely corresponds.

V¹ = the text of Sermon XV, published by Augusti, p. 29, as *editio altera*, from *Cod. Vind. Graec.* 307, Nessel. Called in Migne *editio tertia*.

T = Thilo's text of Sermon XVII, edited on p. 81 after Savile and Montfaucon. I see no proof that he uses *Cod. Nan.* XLIII (now *Ven. Marc.* II, 42), to which he refers (pp. 10, 31). The Vienna manuscript, of which a copy was sent him (p. 84, n. 3), and which he used in editing the text, seems to be V (*i. e.*, the part containing a section of Sermon XVII; see p. 84, n. 2), not *Cod. Graec.* 247, Nessel, which contains all of Sermon XVII, and to which he had called Augusti's attention.

v = *Cod. Vind. Lat.* 1370 s. IX, containing the text here published.

Codd. = All the Greek texts available.

107^v INCIPIT SERMO DE CONFUSIONE DIABOLI ET INFERNI.

Audiens Diabolus Dominum dicentem: *Tristis anima mea usque ad mortem*¹ sperauit se quia mortem uel crucem pertimesceret et capit promptus² fieri. Currens abiit ad Infernum et dixit ei, "Paratus es tu;³ para mihi locum munitum, ubi recludamus eum qui dicitur Christus, quem Iohannes et reliqui prophete dicunt quia uenit et eiecit nos. Ecce paraui aduersus eum mortem; | discipulum eius ad traditionem eius prae-
 108 paraui: paraui clavos,⁴ acutauit lanceas, Iudaeos irritauit sicut sagittas aduersus eum. Omnia feci, omnia praeparaui ad traditionem eius; tu, tantum, paratus es tu ad suscipiendum eum. Multa enim mala mihi ostendit super terram, multum me irritauit, multa uasa mihi subripuit. Quorum ego <in> mala delectabar, hic uerbo suo eos sanabat; et quorum claudibam lumen et delectabar in illis, quando in parietem eos percutiebam aut in aquas mittebam et in lacum uersabantur, ueniens autem ille unde nescio e contrario mihi agens, uerbo eis donabat lumen. Alio autem dum esset in utero matris suae⁵ clausi oculos eius ut nec signum oculorum eius appareret. | Ille autem inueniens eum et lutum de sputo faciens, unguens oculos eius iussit eum ad Siloa lauare et statim uidit. Ego autem non inueniens locum ubi uadam, accipere⁶ ministros meos et abii longe ab eo. Et inueni iuuenem Matheum et introiui in eum cum ministros meos et gaudens habitabam in eo. Quomodo cognouit ille nescio et ueniens increpauit me exire ab eo. Alio quoque principe cuius⁷ filia mortua est et quia dilectissima erat filia parentibus suis, planctu magno plangebant eam. Ego delectabar uidens populum multum plangentem eam, ille autem ueniens unde nescio suscitauit eam et tradidit eam sanam patri suo. Et iterum mulier quaedam fatigata a fluxu sanguinis: per xii annos⁸ canalis sanguinis⁹ eius | descendebat, dum¹⁰ illa¹¹ uidens eum¹¹ transeuntem, occurrit ei et ut solum tetigit fimbriam uestimenti[s] eius, ilico stetit fluxus sanguinis eius. Ego autem furebam aduersus eum et non poteram committere litem cum eo. Exsurgens abii a finibus illis et ueni in¹² finibus Chananeorum et inueni ibi puellam et ingressus sum in eam; quando in ignem eam mittebam et quando in

¹ *Matt.* 26:38.² A mistake or a vulgar variant for *promptus*. Denis would read *presumptus*.³ Denis may be right in reading *paratus esto*. v has *estu*.⁴ v, *clauas*: Codd., ἥλους.⁵ The ablative absolute and the *dum* clause are a rude translation of V, ἄλλον . . . ὑπάρχοντα.⁶ This may be a historical infinitive; cf. *dominare*, p. 11, l. 28. But V, παρέλαβον ἐξ δαίμονας ὑπουργούς suggests *accepi* vi *ministros*, from which *accipere* might have arisen.⁷ Possibly *aliter* (M, ἀλλ' ὅτε. Did his manuscripts have ἄλλοτε?) *quoque principis cuius* (for *alicuius*).⁸ v, *annis*.⁹ v, *sanguis*.¹⁰ v possibly has *autem*.¹¹ v, *ille* . . . *eam*. V, ὁχetoὶ αἵματος . . . κατήρχοντο. Εὐθὺς οὖν ἰδοῦσα τοῦτον ἔδραμεν πρὸς αὐτόν.¹² v, α.

fluuium eam proiciebam, et delectabar in eam, † magnites et¹ mater eius lugebant eam. Ille autem unde cognouit nescio; uenit in finibus illis et habitabat ibi. Ut autem cognouit mater puelle cucurrit et nuntiabat ei de hac puella filia sua dicens ei: *Miserere mei, Domine, Fili David, filia mea male² a demonio uexatur.*³ Ille autem audiens non | respondit 109^v ei uerbum. Et putabam ego quod non possit curare eam et incipio uel istam sub me habere. Et iterum mulier procidens rogabat eum dicens: *Miserere mei, Fili David; filia mea a daemonio uexatur.* Qui respondens dixit ei: *Non est bonum sumere panem filiorum et mittere canibus.*⁴ Cui⁵ respondens mulier dixit: *Domine, nam et catelli edunt de micis quae cadunt de mensa dominorum suorum.*⁶ Qui dixit ad eam: *Mulier, magna est fides tua; fiat tibi sicut petisti.*⁷ Qui noluit ire ad puellam, sed mulieri dedit potestatem ut me effugaret. Ego autem exiui a puella uidens quia ille ibidem erat. Veni in Bethania et inueni amicum eius Lazarum infirmantem et sciens quia ille | longe esset, uolens eum 110^v contristari, rapui eum cum ministros meos in infernum et securus factus sum et sperabam quia non poterat eum ad se leuare. Veniens autem ille cum *sopore*⁸ male occupatus eras⁸ [et]⁹ excussit eum ad se. Dicit ei Infernus, "Si ille est qui Lazarum suscitauit, si ipse est, obsecro te, miserere mei et ne adducas eum hic, quia magnus est. Vox illius tunc sola me contremescit et dissoluit uirtutem meam; uoce(m) sua(m) sola(m) sustinere non potui, et tu ipsum adnuntias ad me adducere? Obsecro te, et miserere mei et ne adducas eum hic, quia si uenerit, et quos habeo inclusos eiciet¹⁰ a me. Ego tunc putrire feci Lazari corpus; quattuor dies tenui eum in locum munitum | et dissolui membra eius et dominare¹¹ omnino ei. Quando autem uenit ad ostium meum exclamabat ei dicens: *Lazare, ueni foras.*¹² Et putrefactus [est] Lazarus exiuit sicut leo expellit ad uenationem aut aquila exiliens quae omnem infirmitatem deponit¹³ in ictu oculi. Et illum hic includere¹⁴ non possum;" Respondit alter diabolus et dixit: "Et infortis et impossibili animo,¹⁵ mihi tanta mala operatus est et recessit. De seculo non cessau i iniqua agens in homines, et tu times? Unum malum quod pertulisti ab eo sic timuisti? Ego tanta mala passus sum et non cessau agens

¹ v, eam / / magnites & mater. I would suggest *magnopere cum mater . . . lugebat*: cf. M and V¹ (V omits), *μάλιστα ὅταν ἡ μήτηρ*.

² v, mala. ³ Matt. 15:22. ⁴ Ibid., vs. 26. ⁵ v, Qui. ⁶ Matt. 15:27. ⁷ Ibid., vs. 28.

⁸ v, *furore* . . . erat. Codd., *ἐν ὕπνῳ κατέκειτο*.

⁹ Possibly *et*, which I have bracketed here and elsewhere, translates an adverbial *καί*.

¹⁰ v, *eiecit*; V, *ἐκβάλλει*. Or, after M, *ἐκβάλλει*, read *eicit*.

¹¹ A historical infinitive. Cf. p. 10, n. 8. For the active form cf. *Venant. Fort.*, 3, 14, 16 Perhaps *dominaui* should be read: Codd., *κατεκυρίευσα*.

¹² Ioan. 11:43.

¹³ v, *deponens*. In this sentence the translation apparently omits several words from the Greek original.

¹⁴ v, *includi*.

¹⁵ The two epithets are probably meant as vocatives, translating *δεῖλὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπε καὶ ὀλιγόψυχε*.

- contra eum, sed quando uidebam <quia> uarias infirmitates de hominum
 111 corpore sanabat, ego incipiebam animas exterminare | per me. Nam inueni
 quendam hominum Matheum et in misi in eum concupiscentias pecuni-
 arum, et accipiens eum statui eum publicanum et diuitem eum feci. Et
 tantum oboediuit mihi adolescens ille omnibus; omnia suadebam, omnia
 rapiebat,¹ caedebat,² colaphizabat, comedebat et absorbebat aliena[s].
 Et gaudebam in eum quia sic opera mea faciebat. Et collegit multa<s>
 pecunia<s> et minas proponebat aduersus eos qui habebant pecunias.
 Et dum iam habuissem eum probatissimum et omnia opera mea perage-
 ret, ueniens ille unde nescio, transiens per teloneum dicit adolescenti:
 111 *Adolescens, ueni post me.*³ Et mox ut uerbum audiuit, et relinquens
 teloneum et pecunias | quas⁴ habebat, quas cum magno labore feci eum
 congregare, sed nec parentibus suis palam faciens et mox sequutus est
 eum et factus est eius discipulus. Et contristatus sum ualde quia talis⁵
 uas recessit a me. Et denique non cessaui agens contra eum sed sperans
 quia⁶ statum illius adolescentis⁷ concupisceret et ideo eum tulisset,
 exsurgens abii in Hiericho et inueni hominem modicum ualde nomine
 Zacheus et introiui in eum et statui illum publicanum. Hic consolatus
 est *tantam*⁸ tristitiam meam quae⁹ aduersus Matheum mihi erat et secu-
 rus factus sum. Putabam me¹⁰ quia¹¹ statum illius non concupisceret,
 112 quia multum modicus erat. Quo modo autem uenit ille | nescio, et trans-
 iens cum multitudine magna.¹² Et Zacheus uero cum esset pusillus non
 poterat eum <videre et>¹³ ascendit in arborem sicomorum. Statim ille
 respiciens, uidens eum dixit ei: *Zache festinans descende; hodie oportet*
*me manere in domo tua.*¹⁴ Et statim descendit et suscepit eum gaudens.
 Exiens reddidit ei omnia quae¹⁵ calumniauerat quadruplum et de sub-
 stantia sua medietate<m> pauperibus erogauit et factus est eius amicus.
 Ego autem non inueniens¹⁶ ubi vadam, omnes deliquerunt me et illi
 adherebant. Qui enim peccabant per ignorantiam seducebam et pro-
 mittebam eis: 'Quia incipistis peccare, de concupiscentia non recedatis

¹ Unless the text is corrupt, this is a rough, paratactic translation of V, ὑπῆκουσεν δὲ τοῦ (M adds ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον) . . . ὥστε πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου ἐποίησεν (ποιεῖν?).

² v, cedebat.

⁴ v, pecuniam quam.

⁶ v, qui ad.

³ Matt. 9:9.

⁵ Read tale?

⁷ v, adolescentem.

⁸ v, est eum et tristitiam; V, τὴν τηλικαύτην λύπην.

⁹ v, quam.

¹⁰ Cf. sperauit se, pp. 10, l. 2; 16, l. 33. Or should datives be read?

¹¹ v, qui a statum.

¹² Read, probably: *quo modo autem nescio, uenit ille, et transiens.* V apparently has ἐκεῖνος δὲ πάλιν, οὐκ οἶδα πῶς, ἦλθεν ἐκεῖνος παριών; V¹, omitting the initial ἐκεῖνος δὲ, has πάλιν . . . ἐκεῖνος καὶ παριών.

¹³ Codd., μὴ δυνάμενος ἰδεῖν.

¹⁴ Luc. 19:5.

¹⁵ This mistranslation, instead of *eis omnibus quos*, may have been due to an error in the translator's original. The manuscripts, apparently, show the various readings, ἐκάστω παρ' ὧν (ἦς, δ) ἐσυκοφάντησε.

¹⁶ As V and V¹ have εὐρίσκω (εὐρίσκα), perhaps *inueni* should be read. Or, after M, make *omnes* . . . *adherebant* parenthetical and *ego* the subject of *seducebam*.

usque in finem, si ex toto ibi iudicabimini.¹ Haec dicens et horum similia suadens omnibus | in concupiscentia malorum.² Veniens ille et aduersos male agentes rogabat peccatores et consolabatur et promittebat eis paenitentiam et remissionem peccatorum et indulgentiam iniquitatum in regna caelorum. Et dicebat omnibus: *Venite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis et ego reficiam uos.*³ Et omnes ad illum occurrebant. Quando autem non inueni locum ubi uadam et factus sum minimus omni<s> creature,⁴ memoratus sum antiqam amicitiam; exsurgens abii ad amicos meos Iudaeos quos ab initio decepi. Memorans auditum⁵ eorum et uadens ad eos inritaui seniores eorum aduersus eum, et omnem multitudinem Iudaeorum armaui contra eum. Tu autem nihil time[s].⁶ Solum para mihi locum munitum ubi recludamus eum.” Respondens⁷ autem Infernus dixit ei, “Ego nunquam | audiui tanta uerba quanta tu mihi suggessisti de eo, sed recede ab eo et ne festines eum hic adducere. Nihil cum eo commune habeas; non enim coniungit olla cum aramento.⁸ Ipsa percutit, ipsa minuetur. Tanta mala tibi fecit, tanta uasa subripuit, quomodo dicis; peccatores et meretrices et raptores tibi tulit et non praesumpsisti ante faciem eius nec uerbum dicere et nunc adduces eum hic, ut spem meam auferat et sine spe faciat similem <me> tibi. Ille si Filius Dei non fuisset tanta mirabilia non fecisset, et si homo fuisset sola carnalia uitia⁹ sanaret. Nam quid et corda publicanorum et peccatorum conuertisset ad paenitentiam et conuersionem? Tu mihi dixisti quia uerbo publicanum conuertit ut relinqueret teloneum. Tu autem contra faciem eius stare et ipsum adnuntias | hic adducere et claudere? Ego scio quid dicunt prophete quos habeo hic inclusos, quomodo eum expectant cum gaudio. Scio quia Iohannes¹⁰ ueniens et euangelizauit eis de illo et timeo eum hic suscipere.” Dicit ei Diabolus, “Illi mentiuntur ut te in formidinem adducant.”¹¹ Dicit ei Infernus, “Quem pronuntiauerunt,¹²

¹ The translation is nearest in sense to V: ἕως τέλους ἀπολαύσατε εἰ [cod., ἡ] ὅλως τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀγαθῶν ξένοι γεγόνατε ἀμαρτήσαντες.

² Part of this sentence is lacking, or else it translates an imperfect original. The Greek codices have ἐπειθα (ἐπειθον) καταφρονεῖν τῶν ἰδίων ψυχῶν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς (τῶν κακῶν) ἐγκυλιεσθαι.

³ Matt. 11:28.

⁴ There is no equivalent in M and V¹ for *et factus . . . creature*. V, ἐκτὸς πάντη, suggests ἔσκατος πάντων as a variant reading from which the translation was made.

⁵ Mistranslates V, ὑπακοῆς.

⁶ Codd., μη(δὲν) δειλιάσης. The *s* is by dittography—unless *timeas* should be read.

⁷ v, *rpā*.

⁸ v, *ulla*. M V, τί κοινωνήσῃ χύτρα πρὸς λέβητα. The form *aramentum* (for *aeramentum*) is cited in DUCANGE, with *aramen*, *aramum*, *araminum*, from very late mediæval sources, but KÖRTING (1901) stars the form, which is assumed as a “substrate” for Span. *arambre*, Ital. *rame*, by GRÖBER, *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie*, Vol. I (1884), p. 242. The word is now proved for the ninth century certainly, and probably for the sixth.

⁹ v, *uita*.

¹⁰ v, *Iohs*.

¹¹ v, *adducunt*.

¹² v, *pronuntiaueŕ*, and so always in this manuscript for the third person plural of the perfect.

quare non sunt mentiti.¹ Omnia quae mihi suggessisti de eo, quia² tibi fecit qui dicitur Christus, praedixerunt prophete. Ecce tu confessus es et adsunt tibi quae dicta sunt ab eis et ante me mendaces³ eos uocas?" Dicit ei Diabolus, "Per uirtutes tuas et insatiabilem uentrem tuum qui⁴ nihilum⁵ potest saturari, noli multum loqui. Omnes me dereliquerunt et ad illum accesserunt et, ut uideo, et tu me derelinquere uis et illius amicus fieri. | Mundum ingluttisti et non dixisti 'Sufficit.' Abraham, Isaac et Iacob et omnes prophetas suscepisti et non formidasti, et nunc per unum inimicum meum tanta formidatione circumdatus es et⁶ nolis eum suscipere. Ego cognoui quia homo est timens [eum] mortem. Nunc autem quomodo cognoui quia adpropinquauit illius hora mortis, timet mortem triste dicens; *Tristis est anima mea usque ad⁷ mortem.*" Dicit ei Infernus, "Ego quidem non uidi eum, neque uidere eum uolo. In quantum audiui, dicam tibi ueritatem, et tu signa sermones meos. Si forte non esset Filius Dei utique! Nam si ille est, scio quia ideo tristar⁸ se dicit ut tibi oblectentur talia uerba; et tu non exilies⁹ a facie eius. Et ue tibi! Eris¹⁰ infelix: deludere enim te uolens talia profer¹¹ uerba. | Sed recede ab eo et ne pugnes cum eo." Dicit ei Diabolus, "Potentes habeo ministros meos et¹² non timeo pugnare cum eo. Unanimes omnes pariter Annas¹³ et Caiaphas et Iudas; hi¹⁴ coheredes mei sunt. Habemus autem et reliquam multitudinem Iudaeorum sub nos. Possumus aduersus eum pugnare. Solum¹⁵ paratus es tu ad suscipiendum eum." Dicit ei Infernus, "Uade quomodo uolueris. Primum¹⁶ mitte pugnam cum eo et si uinceris eum, includamus eum hic, et regnas tu cum Iudaeos. Si autem uincerit te, uenit hic et excutit quos habeo hi in clausos et ligabit¹⁷ te cum Iudaeos et tradet uos mihi. Et uae uobis! Infelices eritis."

115 Haec audiens Diabolus abiit ad Iudaeos et concitauit eos aduersus eum et congregati sunt et consilium confecerunt ut eum proderent. Dominus autem in ipsa nocte erat manens in monte Oliueti cum discipulis¹⁸ suis et cognoscens aduersum se consilium, tunc ait discipulis¹⁸ suis: *Venit hora ut Filius hominis clarificetur*; ¹⁹*uigilate et orate ne intretis in temptationem.*²⁰ Et congregati²¹ omnes Iudaei in unum; uenit Iudas ad eos et dixit eis, "Exsurgentes sequimini me et tradam eum uobis."

¹ The Greek (M VI—V omits—) τὰ περὶ σοῦ, ἀπερ προείπον, οὐκ ἐψεύσαντο suggests *quae pronuntiauerunt, quae de te sunt, non sunt mentiti.*

² Possibly the reading is *quid*.

³ v, *m̄daes.*

⁴ v, *quae.*

⁵ v, *nimum*; M V, ἢν οὐδεὶς δύναται χορτάσαι. Perhaps *quem nemo . . . saturare* should be read.

⁶ Probably not a mistake for *ut*, as codd. have καὶ οὐ θέλεις.

⁷ v, *a.*

⁸ v, *tristar.*

⁹ Or, with no punctuation after *uerba*, read *exilias*.

¹⁰ v, *erit.*

¹¹ V, *προβάλλει*; v, *proferens*.

¹² v, *ut*; codd., καί.

¹³ v, *Anna.*

¹⁴ v, *hic*; M, οὗτοι.

¹⁵ v, *solus*; Codd., μόνον.

¹⁶ v, *prim.*

¹⁷ v, *ligauit.*

¹⁸ v, *discip̄.*

¹⁹ Ioan. 12:23.

²⁰ Matt. 26:41. At this point the translation of Sermon XV ends; that of Sermon XVII begins with the following sentence.

²¹ Perhaps to be taken as nominative absolute.

Qui exsurgentes sequebantur eum cum gladiis et fustibus. Et dedit eis signum dicens: *Quem osculatus fuero, ipse est; tenete eum.*¹ Et cum abisset in locum ubi erat Iesus² cum discipulis³ suis, accedens Iudas osculatus est eum dicens: *Aue Rabbi.*¹ Et Dominus dixit: *Amice, ad quid⁴ venisti?*¹ Osculum amarum plenum iniquitate et perditione, osculum amarum et damnum animae, prouisio⁵ Gehenne! Meretrix osculans pedes Domini animam suam reuocauit a sorde; | Iudas osculatus eum⁶ perdidit animam. Illa osculans de libro iniquitatis deleta est. O mulieris⁷ philosophia, o discipuli imprudentia! Illa osculans pedes domini, gaudebant angeli et coronam ei praeeparabant. Iudas osculans,⁸ gaudebant daemones et funis laqueis torquebatur.⁹ Illa gaudet et ille luget. *Aue Rabbi et osculatus¹⁰ est eum.* Et accedentes tenuerunt eum qui tenet omnem terram palmo. Tenuerunt eum et obtulerunt eum ad Annam et Caiphan principes¹¹ sacerdotum et quaerebant falsum testimonium aduersus eum et non inuenerunt. Et adduxerunt eum ad Pilatum et statuerunt eum ante Pilatum. Et interrogauit eum Pilatus dicens: *tu es rex Iudaeorum?*¹² Et Iesus¹³ non respondit ei. Stabat enim secundum scripturam dicentem: *Sicut ovis ad occisionem ductus est et non ape* | *ruit os suum.*¹⁴ Pilatus sedebat iudicans eum qui iudicaturus est uiuos et mortuos.¹⁵ Stabat et contendebat contra Dominum iudicaturum pro mundi salutem.¹⁶ Ex ipsis causis cognouit Pilatus quia per inuidiam tradiderunt eum. *Innocens sum ego a sanguine iusti huius: uos uideritis.*¹⁷ Et Iudas uidens quia damnatus est, reddidit argenteos¹⁸ in templo, abiit, laqueo se suspendit. Et impletum est quod dictum est per prophetam dicentem: *conuertetur dolor eius in capite eius et in uerticem eius iniquitas eius descendit.*¹⁹ Et dixit ad eos Pilatus, "Nullam causam mortis inuenio in homine," et uolens eum dimittere dicit ad eos, "Consuetudo est uobis unum dimittere malefactorem. Audite, dimittam uobis Christum cui nullam causam mortis inuenio." | Illi autem homicidam petierunt dimitti et iustificabant impium, ad Iesum²⁰ clamantes et dicentes: *Crucifige.* Tunc Pilatus flagellatum eum tradidit ut crucifigeretur. Flagellatus est Dominus noster ut nos de Diaboli obligatione et plaga eriperet. Coronatus est spinis ut solueret quae aduersos nos erant maledictiones. Spinis et tribulos quae nobis per

115 v

116

116 v

¹ Matt. 26: 48 ff. ² v, *ihs.* ³ v, *discip.* ⁴ v, *qd.* ⁵ *prouisto(?)*. ⁶ v, *e.*

⁷ v, *mulier*; T, *γυναικός*. ⁸ v, *osculas*. ⁹ v, *torquebantur*. ¹⁰ v, *osulatus*.

¹¹ v, *principibus*. Here, it would seem, the suspension *princip* (cf. *discip*, above) was filled out erroneously by the ninth-century scribe.

¹² Matt. 27: 11.

¹³ v, *ihs.*

¹⁴ Isa. 53: 7.

¹⁵ v, *moñ*.

¹⁶ This sentence differs considerably from T—possibly the Latin text is corrupt. The accusative after *pro* may have been intentional, as the text in the edition of SAVILE reads *ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίαν*.
¹⁷ Matt. 27: 24.

¹⁸ The homoioteleuta ἀπέδωκε τὰ ἀργύρια . . . ῥίψας τὰ ἀργύρια (*argenteos*) explain the omission of a translation for τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι . . . τὰ ἀργύρια. Possibly the mistake was made by the original translator.
¹⁹ Ps. 7: 17. ²⁰ v, *ihs.*

praeuarcationem de terra ante fuerant¹ suscepit. Corona de spinis in caput suum ut solueret quae erant aduersus nos maledictiones. Crucifixus est in ligno ut solueret peccatum. Per lignum Adam excussus est de paradyso. Satan per lignum Domini quod est signum crucis
 117 persequitur. Per lignum enim Domini | latro paradysum² meruit intrare, et quod est mirabile, fratres dilectissimi, sexta die paradyso ei aperuit. Propterea Dominus noster sexta die sustinuit crucem, ut in ipso die paradyso aperiret. Formidans audiuit latro uocem Domini, introiuit in paradysum.³ Quando autem uidit Diabolus quia per continentiam facta sunt omnia et mirabilia quae facta sunt in cruce, sol⁴ obscuratum et terre motum factum et uelum templi scissum, et cum tanta uidisset Diabolus fugit ad Infernum dicens⁵ ei: "Uae mihi misero; inlus⁶us s⁷um." Adiuua miseriam meam. Claudamus ostia ut ne intro eat hic. Obsera⁷ uectes ferreos; cum omni uirtute resistamus ei et ne recipiamus eum hic."
 117^v Cucurrit Infernus et uectes ferreos obserauit.⁸ |

Et ecce Dominus ueniens ad⁹ infernum persequens Diabolum, et uirtutes praecurrentes dixerunt: *tollite portas principes uestras*¹⁰ et reliqua. Et quasi ignorans dixit Infernus: *Dominus uirtutum ipse est rex gloriae*.¹¹ Et respondit iterum Infernus, "Quis est hic de quo dixisti? Et si ipse est, quem querit hic? <Cur uoluit>¹² derelinquere caelum et descendere ad nos?" Et uirtutes dixerunt "*Quia rex est gloriae*. Uolens inimicum persequere descendit ligare et tradere eum tibi et milites suos excutere et conuocare eos." Et respondens¹³ Infernus dixit Diabolo, "Tricapite et Beelzebub, derisio sanctorum, infortis, inuide, non tibi dixi ne pugnes cum eo? Ecce nunc quae¹⁴ praedixi aduenerunt tibi, et quid facies miser? Quare non oboedisti uerbis meis? | Et nunc uenit et querit te, et propter te captiuus fio.¹⁵ Et si potes, miser, pugna cum eo. Ego enim te adiuuare non possum." Et Diabolus plorans ei¹⁶ dixit, "Miserere mei et ne aperias ei. Forsitan reuertitur ad Nazaret, qui non credebat uerbum eius. Quando timens mortem dicebat: *Tristis est*¹⁷ *anima mea usque ad mortem*, quando autem orabat dicens; *Pater si fieri potest, transeat a me calix iste*¹⁸ haec uerba oblectans dicebat, et ego infelix nesciebam. Sperabam me quia timens mortem haec diceret <et> trista-

¹ v, fuerat.² v, paradyssi.³ At this point begins the excerpt from this Sermon in V.⁴ v, sol: for sol of the original(?).⁵ v, diC.⁶ v, inlusum; T, ἐνπαίχθην; V, ὅτι ἐνπαίχθην (ἐνπαίχθη?).⁷ v, obsera.⁸ v, obserauit.⁹ v, ueniens . . . ad. Perhaps uenit should be read: TV, ἐρχεται.¹⁰ Ps. 23:7.¹¹ Here another omission seems to have been made, owing to homoioteleuta.¹² V, τί κατέλιπεν (T, κατέλιπετον) . . . καὶ κατέβη. Perhaps, cur derelinquit . . . descendit.¹³ v, respd.¹⁴ v, quē; codd., ἀ προείπον . . . πάρεστι.¹⁵ v, procerte . . . fies; Codd., διὰ σοῦ . . . γίνομαι.¹⁶ v, ε; codd., πρὸς αὐτόν.¹⁷ v, es.¹⁸ Matt. 26:39.

retur.” Et uirtutes praecurrentes dicebant, *Tollite portas principes uestras* et reliqua. Prophete autem uoce *rex gloriae*¹ gaudebant et exultabant. Et Iohannes dicebat, “Nonne dixi uobis quia ueniet et aperiet nos?” Et omnes letabantur² et ingreditur rex glorie et Infernus | nolebat.³ Responditque propheta Dauid et dixit, “Sinite eum. Oportet enim adimplere prophetiam meam. Quando enim fui super terram [eram] praeuidi quod futurum erat quia non aperiet ex se. Dixi enim de eo quia *contriiuit portas ereas et uectes ferreos confringet*;⁴ et uirtutes inferni conculcauit et dolores mortis soluit. Aculeum <inferni confregit>⁵ et completum est quod dictum est: *Ubi est mors stimulus tuus? Ubi est inferne uirtus tua?*”⁶ Obuiauerunt autem prophetae Dominum dicentes⁷ et ymnum dicentes *Benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini*.⁸ Tunc adprehendit Dominus Diabolum et ligauit eum indissolutis uinculis et deposuit eum in inferiora terrae et substernit eum ignem inextinguibilem, et uermes non moriuntur: et clausus plorans et suspirans. Et Dominus adsumens secum | omnes prophetas [et] eiecit eos de inferno. Primus Dauid percutiebat cythara<m> et dicebat: “*uenite exultemus Domino*⁹ et reliqua; quia rex noster pugnans¹⁰ pro nobis uicit.”¹¹ Et omnes responderunt:¹² *Omnes gentes plaudite manibus*¹³ et reliqua; quia rex noster pugnans¹⁰ pro nobis uicit.” Et alius propheta dicebat: “*Letentur caeli et exultet terra*,¹⁴ quia rex noster pugnans¹⁵ pro nobis uicit.” Et sic exultantes pergebant ad paradysum et ingredienti inuenerunt ibi latronem et expauerunt dicentes, “Quis te introduxit hic? Quis autem aperuit tibi et quid est opera tua quia prius de nobis hic introisti? Numquid hic ac furtum uenisti facere? Non te sufficeieba<n>t terrena? Et si hic uenisti ad rapere,¹⁶ dic nobis, quis te introduxit hic? Non inuidemus¹⁷ quia prius introisti hic sed causam queramus.” Qui respondit eis, “Propter opera mea non eram dignus introire hic | sed Dominus amator hominum et misericors introduxit me. Ego autem nullum bonum

v118

119

v119

¹ The sentence is intelligible in its present form; yet the Greek — ἀκούσαντες τὰς φωνὰς (τὴν φωνήν) τοῦ βασιλέως — suggests *uoce regis gloriae audita*.

² v, *letabuntur*; Codd., ἡσφραίνοντο.

³ This supports the reading ἡνείκερο; see Thilo's note, p. 87.

⁴ Ps. 106:16.

⁵ TV, τὰ κέντρα τοῦ ἔδου συνέθλασε.

⁶ 1 Cor. 15:55. In the Latin translation, as in V, the words of St. Paul are most probably uttered by the mouth of David. Thilo's criticism (p. 87, n. 4) of Augusti on this point is considerably weakened in case his text proves to be inferior to V and v.

⁷ One or more participles may be omitted here. *Dicentes* gives new support for λέγοντες, which Thilo declares wrong.

⁸ Matt. 21:9.

⁹ Ps. 94:1.

¹⁰ v, *pugnati*: T, πολέμησας.

¹¹ This appears to be an impromptu liturgy, suggested perhaps by *Judith* 5:16: *deus eorum pugnavit pro eis et uicit*.

¹² At this point in V the excerpt ends.

¹³ Ps., 46:1.

¹⁴ Ps. 95:11.

¹⁵ v, *pugnauit*. Here, and in ll. 4 and 7, the original may have been *pugn̄*. Or read *pugnauit* . . . <et> *uicit*.

¹⁶ v, *ad ra* | *rapere*.

¹⁷ v, *inuidem*.²

feci. Inde condemnauerunt me Iudaei reum mortis et uolentes me perdere mortificauerunt simul crucifigentes me cum Domino. Et uidi ego signa quae faciebat et intellexi quia Filius Dei est. Clamaui uoce magna dicens: *Memento Domine cum ueneris in regnum tuum.*¹ Statim suscipiens Dominus orationem meam [et] dixit mihi: *Hodie mecum eris in paradyso.*² Et dedit mihi signum crucis. 'Hunc accipiens,' dixit: 'Vade ad paradysum: et si uetauerit te ignis arumphea³ introire in paradysum, ostende ei hunc regalem signum et aperiet tibi.' Et ueniens ego, statim ut uidit me ignis arumphea qui custodiebat paradysum clausit ostia. Ego autem dixi, 'Rex gloriae qui crucifixus est ipse me misit' et osten | <di> illam crucem et statim aperuit mihi. Et ingrediens neminem inueni et expaui in cogitatione mea et dixi in me ipso, 'Ubi est Abraham, Isaac et Iacob et reliqua multitudo sanctorum et prophetarum?' Et cum hec cogitare, ecce apparuerunt in dextera parte orientis duo uiri et mirabiles⁴ uisione et electi uultu et interrogauerunt dicentes, 'Quis es tu? Abraham non es.'⁵ illius enim schema sacerdotalis est. Moyses non es; illius autem loquela tarda est et tua loquela clara est. Tu latro uideris esse et schema tua latro est.' Et confessus sum quia latro eram et Dominus paradyssi⁶ introduxit me hic quia perrexi cum eo ad mortem quam pertulit pro nobis. Et dixi ad eos, 'Obsecro uos, qui estis?' et respondens⁷ unus ex eis dixit mihi. 'Ego Helias sum Thesbites qui per igneum currum⁸ adductus sum hic: et ille qui mecum est, Enoc, qui translatus est | uerbo Dei. Et prophetae audientes glorificauerunt Dominum de tali dono quod⁹ dat peccatoribus. Et Dominus monens¹⁰ Infernum et Mortem conculcans, Diabolum ligans, mundum liberans, a mortuis resurgens (*mors illi ultra non dominabitur*)¹¹ ascendit ad caelos, sedit ad dexteram patris, unde expectamus eum uenturum et iudicaturum uiuos et mortuos et omne saeculum¹² per ignem, cum Sancto Spiritu et sanctam ecclesiam in uitam aeternam: ipso Domino nostro, cui sit honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

¹ *Luc.* 23:42.² *Ibid.*, 43.³ *Ignis* is genitive. The initial *a* of *arumphea* seems to represent the rough breathing in *ῥομφαία*. Though I can find no parallels for this elsewhere in Latin, one may compare the transfer of certain Germanic roots into Romance; e. g., *ahd*, *hring*, *Ital.*, *aringo*. See DIEZ, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1887), p. 25.⁴ v, *mirabilis*.⁵ v, *nom.*⁶ v, *paradysum*; T, ὁ δεσπότης τοῦ παραδείσου.⁷ v, *rp̄d.*⁸ v, *igneam currem*.⁹ v, *quae*.¹⁰ Or is the reading *mouens*? Either is mild for *σκυλεύσας*.¹¹ *Rom.* 8:9. This citation is not in T, and there are various other differences in the closing words. I have not attempted to remedy the Latin text, which is obviously corrupt in several details.¹² v, *sc̄lm.*

EDWARD KENNARD RAND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.